

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 JANE DOE #2,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 MARCUS JOHNSON, et al.,
15 Defendants.
No. 2:24-cv-01844-DJC-AC
ORDER APPROVING MINOR
COMPROMISE

18 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's *ex parte* Motion for Administrative Relief
19 to Proceed by Pseudonym.¹ Plaintiff seeks to proceed under a pseudonym as the
20 case involves allegations of sexual abuse, which raise issues regarding the privacy and
21 the safety of Plaintiff. For the reasons stated below, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's
22 Motion for Administrative Relief to Proceed by Pseudonym (ECF No. 3). However,
23 Defendants may seek reconsideration of the Motion should Defendants object once
24 they have appeared in the case.

25 | ////

27 ¹ Plaintiff did not file this Motion explicitly as an *ex parte* request. However, the Motion was filed without
28 being noticed on the calendar or proof of service and before Defendants have appeared in the action.
Accordingly, the Court will view this, at this stage, as an *ex parte* motion.

LEGAL STANDARD

2 "The normal presumption in litigation is that parties must use their real names."

3 *Doe v. Kamehameha Schools/Bernice Pauahi Bishop Est.*, 596 F.3d 1036, 1042 (9th Cir.

4 2010); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(a) ("[t]he title of the complaint must name all the

5 parties"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a)(1) ("An action must be prosecuted in the name of the

6 real party in interest."). The Ninth Circuit has held that "a party may preserve his or her

7 anonymity in judicial proceedings in special circumstances when the party's need for

8 anonymity outweighs prejudice to the opposing party and the public's interest in

9 knowing the party's identity." *Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d

10 1058, 1068 (9th Cir. 2000). This may be the case where a pseudonym is "necessary . . .

11 to protect a person from harassment, injury, ridicule or personal embarrassment." *Id.*

12 at 1067-68. "Courts have generally permitted plaintiffs to proceed anonymously

13 when their claims involved allegations of sexual assault or rape." *Doe v. Rose*, No. 15-

14 cv-07503-MWF-JC, 2016 WL 9137645, at *1 (C.D. Cal. June 17, 2016) (collecting

15 cases).

DISCUSSION

17 Plaintiff here has brought claims related to sexual abuse allegedly perpetrated
18 by Defendant Marcus Johnson. (See Compl. (ECF No. 1) ¶¶ 25-41.) Plaintiff states
19 that proceeding under a pseudonym will help maintain Plaintiff's privacy and ensure
20 that Plaintiff does not face retaliation from publicly filing a lawsuit after initially filing
21 grievances that led to investigations. (See Mot. (ECF No. 3) at 2-3.)

22 In light of the above, the Court finds good cause to GRANT Plaintiff's request at
23 this stage of the proceedings based on the sensitive nature of the allegations and the
24 potential threat of retaliation Plaintiff faces, which outweighs the minimal prejudice
25 Defendants would face because they may obtain Plaintiff's name from the internal
26 grievances and investigations. However, Defendants may seek reconsideration of the
27 issue should Defendants object once they have appeared in this action. See *Doe v.*

1 *County of San Joaquin*, 2:24-cv-00899-CKD, 2024 WL 1344677, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Mar.
2 29, 2024).

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For the reasons set forth above, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for
5 Administrative Relief to Proceed by Pseudonym (ECF No. 3), subject to
6 reconsideration once Defendants have appeared in this action. This matter is referred
7 back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for all further pretrial proceedings.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: September 5, 2024


Hon. Daniel J. Calabretta
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 DJC3 - mcnelis.22cv369.minors.compromise
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28